## BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

IN RE APPLICATION NO. 99-1	)		
	)	EXHIBIT	(KCG-T)
SUMAS ENERGY 2 GENERATION	)		
FACILITY	)		

## PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

NW ENERGY COALITION AND WASHINGTON ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL

WITNESS: K.C. GOLDEN

1 I. Introduction

- 2 Q. Please state your name and business address.
- 3 **A.** K.C. Golden, 322 29th Ave., Seattle, WA 98122.
- 4 Q. By whom are you employed and in what position?
- 5 A. I am Coordinator of the global warming project for the City of Seattle.
- 6 Q. Please summarize your education and business experience.
- 7 A. I earned a BA in Social Sciences from the University of California at Berkeley and a
- 8 Master's in Public Policy, with an emphasis on energy and the environment, from
- 9 Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. I have worked on
- regional energy issues in the public and private non-profit sectors since 1989. During
- that time, I have served extensively on a variety of task forces and advisory groups
- related to energy supply, energy facility siting, integrated resource planning, and state and
- regional energy policy.
- 14 Q. What are your current responsibilities for the City of Seattle?
- 15 A. I coordinate the City's global warming project. The project consists of 1) efforts to
- reduce the City's greenhouse gas emissions and the emissions over which City policies
- and actions have influence, and 2) efforts to support policy, planning, and technology
- initiatives that advance broader solutions to global climate change.
- 19 Q. Please state the issues you will address in your direct testimony.
- 20 A. I will address the City's policy with respect to greenhouse gas emissions related to
- electricity supply and its preliminary plans for implementing this policy; the significance
- of this policy with respect to Seattle City Light's energy resource development and

EXHIBIT\_\_\_\_ (KCG-T)

1		acquisition activities; and the significance of this policy with respect to the market for
2		fossil-fueled electric power resources.
3		II. DISCUSSION
4	A.	Please describe the City of Seattle's current greenhouse gas emissions policy.
5	A.	The City's global warming project seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from all
6		sectors in ways that are practical, cost-effective, and supportive of other City goals. On
7		April 10, 2000, the City Council passed a resolution (#30144, attached) that specifically
8		addresses greenhouse gases related to production and consumption of electricity. The
9		resolution calls on Seattle City Light to:
10		■ Establish a long-range goal of meeting the electric energy needs of Seattle with no net
11		greenhouse gas emissions.
12		<ul> <li>Meet growing demand with no net increase in greenhouse gas emissions, beginning</li> </ul>
13		immediately, by:
14		• Using cost-effective energy efficiency and renewable resources to meet as much
15		load growth as possible
16		• Mitigating or offsetting greenhouse gas emissions associated with any fossil fuels
17		used to meet load growth.
18	Q.	Why did the City adopt this policy?
19	<b>A.</b>	The Mayor and Council adopted this goal for reasons including the following:
20		1) It demonstrates leadership on an urgent environmental issue.
21		2) It builds on City Light's existing tradition of clean energy production and energy
22		efficiency investment.

1		3) It allows us to meet our growing electricity requirements at a cost that is affordable in
2		both economic and environmental terms.
3		4) It helps to build the market for clean energy resources and fossil-fueled resources that
4		mitigate or offset their emissions.
5		5) It addresses a pressing environmental issue prospectively, reducing our exposure to
6		future internal cost increases and reducing the environmental cost of our electricity
7		services.
8	Q.	What actions will Seattle City Light take to reduce greenhouse gas emissions?
9	A.	City Light will take actions in the following three areas:
10		1) City Light will acquire all cost-effective energy efficiency available from facilities in
11		its service area. In determining cost-effectiveness, City Light will quantify and
12		incorporate the cost of environmental externalities, including greenhouse gases,
13		associated with emissions from fossil-fueled facilities. We have recently completed a
14		new Conservation Potential Assessment and are evaluating significant increases in our
15		already aggressive energy efficiency programs.
16		2) City Light will seek to acquire electricity from renewable resources that generate no
17		greenhouse gas emissions. City Light is currently developing a request for proposals for
18		such resources.
19		3) Due to the loss of some existing resources and the expiration of power purchase
20		contracts, and to robust load growth, City Light may require new resources beyond what
21		it can purchase at an acceptable cost from carbon-free sources. We are currently
22		evaluating the relative merits of relying on market purchases to meet resource deficits,
23		building our own gas-fired resource, or contracting for the output of a gas-fired resource.
		IBIT (KCG-T)  CC/WEC  3

1		Insofar as we turn to these fossil-fueled options, we will mitigate or acquire offsets for the
2		associated greenhouse gas emissions.
3	Q.	What are the most effective investments from the City's perspective to achieve
4		greenhouse gas emission reductions?
5	A.	We believe that carbon-free energy production is one of the most important climate
6		protection strategies we can undertake. Our first priority will be more efficient use of
7		existing energy resources. We regard energy efficiency as an energy resource that is
8		functionally equivalent to electricity from a power plant, but generally cheaper and
9		cleaner. Substantial energy efficiency is available for less than the cost of new generating
10		resources. Our second priority will be new renewable resources that emit no greenhouse
11		gases.
12		Insofar as we need fossil-fueled resources to meet our loads, we will evaluate a range of
13		potential mitigation or offset options. The provisions for greenhouse gas reduction and
14		offsets in Oregon's siting law have resulted in a growing market for such offsets.
15		However, we maintain a preference for carbon-free energy resources, because, as with
16		most environmental issues, prevention is preferable to mitigation.
17	R.	From an economic perspective, how does the City justify a long-range goal of
18		meeting Seattle's electric energy needs with no net greenhouse gas emissions?
19	A.	The no net greenhouse gas emission goal has the following economic advantages:
20		1) It reduces ratepayers' exposure to the financial risks associated with regulatory
21		changes that are likely to internalize the cost of carbon dioxide (CO <sub>2</sub> ) emissions in the
22		future. We believe that, as the external cost of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions becomes more apparent,

1	pressure will grow to internalize those costs through regulation. By avoiding or
2	internalizing these costs prospectively, we expect to minimize our long-term costs.

- 2) Insofar as it reduces our reliance on fossil fuels, it reduces exposure to fuel-price fluctuations. And to the extent that we meet the goal through energy efficiency, renewable resources, or gas-fired resources with long-term price contracts and CO, mitigation, it reduces our exposure to market price fluctuations.
- 3) It reduces the enormous and difficult to quantify external costs associated with damages from greenhouse gas emissions. Even in the unlikely event that these costs remain unregulated and external, they are very real and likely to be exceedingly large. The fact that these costs are "external" and "environmental" does not mean they are not "economic." Although the financial costs of sweeping changes to global ecosystems is impossible to quantify with accuracy, we believe that averting global climate change by switching to carbon-free energy sources and offsetting emissions is likely to be far less costly in economic terms than continuing to increase emissions and adapting to the consequences. Although we cannot unilaterally prevent global climate change, we can do our part and invite others to do theirs.
- 0. What are the ramifications of the City's greenhouse gas emissions policy for power purchases by Seattle City Light?
- 19 As discussed above, the policy confers a clear preference for power resources that emit no A. 20 greenhouse gases. Insofar as we build or contract for the output of specific fossil-fueled 21 resources, we will purchase offsets for greenhouse gas emissions that have not already 22 been mitigated or offset by the supplier. Suppliers who purchase credible offsets for their 23 own greenhouse gas emissions will have an advantage over those who do not. The lower **EXHIBIT** (KCG-T)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1		the net emissions of the supply source, the more attractive it will be to City Light.
2		Because of our no net greenhouse gas emission policy, this preference for low-emission
3		resources now has a discrete, internalized economic value to City Light – the value of
4		CO <sub>2</sub> offsets that we will not have to purchase if the resource developer has already
5		mitigated or offset its own emissions.
6	S.	Does that conclude your testimony?
7 8	Т.	Yes.
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
	EXHI NWE Page (	C/WEC

1	
2	END OF TESTIMONY
3	I declare under penalty of perjury that the above testimony is true and correct to the best of my
4	knowledge.
5	DATED: June 16, 2000
6	By:
7	K.C. Golden
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
	EXHIBIT (KCG-T) NWEC/WEC Page 7

1

2